

MICHELLE DRIVER, as next friend of )  
RICHARD J. DRIVER, JR., )  
) )  
*Plaintiff,* )  
) )  
v. ) Case No. 4:09-cv-69 )  
) )  
JUNE HARMENING, CHARLES ) Judge Mattice )  
HARMENING, JOHN RICHARDSON, ) )  
RICHARD BOLLES, and FAYETTEVILLE ) )  
MAIN STREET, ) )  
) )  
*Defendants.* ) )  
) )

Thus, pursuant to Rule 4(m), if a plaintiff has not timely served a defendant and shows good cause for such failure, the Court must extend the time for service. If, however, no good cause for such failure is shown, Rule 4(m) permits the Court to choose, in its discretion, either to dismiss the action without prejudice as to that defendant or to direct that service be effected within a specified time.

In this case, there is no evidence in the record that Plaintiff has served the Complaint and Summons on Defendants. Further, Plaintiff failed to respond to the Court's show cause order and, therefore, has not provided good cause for the failure to timely serve Defendants. As a result, pursuant to Rule 4(m), the Court is within its power to dismiss without prejudice Plaintiff's action.

### **III. Conclusion**

Accordingly, for the reasons explained above, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). The Clerk is directed to close the file in this case.

**SO ORDERED** this 6th day of January, 2010.

/s/Harry S. Mattice, Jr.  
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE